

BROBDINGNAG

Brobdingnag #71 1966AV (F'08) 1966AQ (W'09) 4 October 1967

MAIN HARBORS OF EUROPE IN BRITISH HANDS ROYAL NAVY SEIZES OSTEND, MARSEILLES, SALONIKA

Game 1966AV

Fall 1906

The moves:

GERMANY (Shagrin): Army Piedmont to Venice. Army Vienna to Trieste.
Army Tyrol support army Vienna to Trieste. Army Bohemia to Vienna. Army Munich to Bohemia. Army Galicia support army Bohemia to Vienna. Army Silesia support army Galicia. Army Livonia to Moscow. Fleet Kiel to Baltic. Army Denmark stand. Army Ukraine (not ordered) stands.

ENGLAND (Wells): Fleet Greece to Bulgaria (South coast). Fleet Ionian Sea to Greece. Fleet Tunis to Ionian Sea. Fleet Tyrrhenian Sea support Fleet Tunis to Ionian. Fleet Guld of Lyon to Marseilles. Fleet English Channel to Belgium. Fleet Norwegian Sea to North Sea. Fleet Mid-Atlantic to English Channel. Army Sweden to Denmark. Fleet St. Petersburg (~~north coast~~) to Livonia (sic).

RUSSIA (Zelazny): Army Warsaw to Livonia. Army Moscow support army Sevastopol to Ukraine. Army Sevastopol to Ukraine. Army Budapest to Galicia. Army Rumania support army Budapest to Galicia. Fleet Constantinople to Aegean Sea. Fleet Apulia / Venice support

ITALY (Fransic): Army Naples to Rome. Army Venice to Tyrolia. Army Trieste to Tyrolia.

As a result of these moves the belligerent powers control the supply centres listed below:

ENGLAND: 3 home, ~~Norway~~, Sweden, St. Petersburg, Belgium, Brest, Marseilles, 2 Iberian, Tunis, Greece, Bulgaria. 14 in all. Could build 4 but has only space for 3.

RUSSIA: Sevastopol, Moscow, Warsaw, 3 Turkish, Rumania, Serbia, Budapest. 9 in all. Could build 2 but has no available space.

GERMANY: 3 home, Denmark, Holland, Paris, Vienna. 7 in all. Must remove 4.

ITALY: 3 home, Trieste. 4 in all. May build 1.

Deadline for adjustment orders is Wednesday, 18 October 1967.

PRESS RELEASE:

The government of Italy conveys its deepest regrets to the Russian High Command at having blown it.

Game 1966AQ

**FRENCH BUILD LAND FORCES IN SOUTH
RUSSIANS SEA FORCES IN NORTH**

Fall 1909: The retreats:

RUSSIA: Berlin to Prussia.

GERMANY: Not ordered. Army Warsaw is disbanded.

Winter 1909: The builds:

RUSSIA (Reinsel): Build fleet St. Petersburg (north coast).

FRANCE (Thompson): Build army Marseilles.

Deadline for moves for Spring 1910 is Saturday 21 October 1967.
Players should note question, raised elsewhere in this issue, about
deadlines. They are asked to submit an answer with their moves.

PRESS RELEASES

Constantinople, Dec. 3. Abdul Osman III today delivered a key address to the populace. This was one of the few public addresses ever made by the present Sultan. His main comments centered around, "My people, a year ago I promised peace within two years. Now I must tell you that your sons and fathers must fight on for at least another three years. However, we shall not and cannot waver from our stand! We shall support the Tsar and his armies until peace returns to Europe! France shall be destroyed!"

Paris, 10 Dec. Russia has acted with honor toward France. Turkey has not. The construction of a new French army in Marseilles will further demonstrate to Turkey that she will indeed find the Gulf of Lyon, or any French cities, or any other gains, very very difficult to obtain. We note that Turkey has lost strength since she attacked France. Russia will find Germany easy to acquire.

Geneve, 15 Dec. The Turkish consulate issued the following communique: Word has it that fighting once again will be general from Norway to the Ionian Sea. While another naval action will surely be fought off Sicily, Germany will again be a battle ground. Germany may suffer more damage than in the Thirty Years' War. First her sons were killed in the front lines, now the country itself is being ravaged.

Paris. 1 Jan. The activity in Marseilles will re-inforce the Piedmont defenses. Turkey will find Lyon and Piedmont most difficult to seize. Russia will find France willing to negotiate a peace and alliance.

- - - - -

"The object of most diplomacy is to postpone decisions."

A. J. P. Taylor: The Trouble Makers.

BROBDINGNAG Current Game Rating List - #7

Judging by the letter from Charles Turner in the last issue, there is some slight demand for a current game rating list. One is provided below. It covers all completed games, as given in the BROB Completed Game Rating list (BROB #69), together with all games in progress which have advanced as far as the first elimination. As always with BROB Rating Lists it includes regular games, either 7-man or 5-man, but no variants.

+23 John Moning John McCallum (W) John Smythe (W) Charles Wells (W)	+ 3 John Austin Dan Barrows Chuck Carey Ken Davidson Thomas Griffin William Linden Jim Pattee Gene Prosnitz Conrad von Metzke (W)	- 1 Brian Bailey Dave Francis Terry Huston
+18 Derek Nelson (W)	+ 2 Clyde Johnson Greg Long Mike McIntyre Jock Root Jim Sanders Bob Westen	- 2 Bob Adams Brenda Banks Dan Brannan Leonard Garland Al Goggins Greg Molenaar James Munroe Geo. Parks
+15 Don Miller (W) Jerry Pournelle (W)		- 3 Wayne Moheisel Al Scott
+14 Charles Turner (W)	+ 1 John Beshara Douglas Beyerlein Bill Christian Louis Curtiss Thomas Eller Wayne Gibbs Steve Gordon Bill Haggart Michael Makulin Christina Krogh Dave Lebling - Maddox John Mazon Frank Musbach Cliff Ollila Frank Reinhardt Mike Santos Bob Speed SDDC&CBW Mehran Thomson Ben Turk	- 4 Michael Aita Len Bailes Clint Bigglestone John Boardman Art Canfil Bob Cline Ken Flethther Dennis Brisch Alexis Gilliland Jack Harness Dave McDaniel Charles Reinsel Anders Swenson Richard Uhr
+10 Frank Clark James Dygert Terry Kuch Rod Walker		- 5 Tom Bulmer Scott Duncan Stuart Keshner Fritz Mulhauser Stephen Patt Bill Stewart Jerry Tenney
+ 9 Larry Peery Monte Zelazny	0 Edwin Baker Donald Berman Bill Bogert John Davey Ben Mendin Gail Schow (. . .)	- 6 Wm Cellestre Jack Chalker Thomas Gorman Jack Longbine Jerry Page (. . .)
+ 8 James MacKenzie (W) Harold Kaus Earl Thompson		
+ 7 James Latimer (W) Banks Mebane		
+ 6 Mark Ovinga Harold Peck Bruce Pelz (W)		
+ 5 Rick Brooks Michael Dobson Jack Greene Bud Pendergrass Chris Wagner		
+ 4 Len Atkins Richard Bryant Alan Tuff (W) Robert Lake Kenneth Levinson Dian Pelz Richard Shagrin		

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| - 6 Rick Payment
Don Recklies
John Sandoval
Bill Schreffler | -11 Jerald Jacks
Ron Parks |
| - 7 Ron Bounds | -12 Stephen Barr
Fred Lerner |
| - 8 Sidney Get
James Goldman
Robert Ward | -13 Edi Birsan |
| -9 Barry Gold | -19 Charles Alexander
Phil Castora |
| -10 Paul Harley
Bernie Eling
Joel Sattel
Richard Schultz | -20 Roland Tzudiker |
| | -28 Margaret Gemignani. |
- - - - -

The "Stalemated" Game.

There are a number of cases, lately appearing, in which there are more than two survivors, but in which ~~neither~~ ^{if} ~~them~~ have any opportunity to force a victory. Several such games have cropped up in Graustark, there is one impending in stab, and, in the last issue Charles Turner mentioned a similar game. I think in ADAG. Strangely, none of these appeared in the first four years of postal play, but they now appear quite common. By common consent they appear to be called "stalemated" games, although the name is something of a mis-nomer.

In Graustark #140, John Boardman bring up the question of what to do with such games. He there states that the rule he will follow in Graustark is that if three playing "years" elapse with no change of supply centre occurring, then he will declare the game a draw and end it. He draws an analogy between that decision and the "fifty-move" rule in chess.

Chess having been brought into this, first by the use of the term "stalemate" to describe the situation, and secondly by referring to the 50-move rule, let us look at the ways that a chess game can end. They are the following:

1. Checkmate, i.e., an outright win.
2. Resignation. The weaker player realizes that a checkmate against him is only a matter of time and concedes the game.
3. Draw by mutual agreement. This usually occurs when both players have been so reduced in strength that they feel that a mate is not possible by either side.
4. Draw by stalemate. One player, invariably the weaker in material strength on the board, is not in check but cannot move without going into check. Notice that there is nothing analogous to this in our game - the whole idea of a chess stalemate arises from the fact of

there being alternate moves in chess, unlike the simultaneous move feature of Diplomacy.

5. Draw by perpetual check. A player can be put in check on every move of his opponent but can get out of it on his own ~~turn~~ to play. The commonest instance is that the materially weaker player has two adjacent squares available for his king; the opponent can attack either square but not both simultaneously. The attacked king then oscillates between the two squares. The situation can, formally, lead to 6, below, but usually goes to 3, above, instead.

6. The 50-move rule, which states that either player can call a draw if he can prove that 50 consecutive moves have been made by both players without a piece being captured, and without a pawn being moved. In serious games, in which a transcript of the moves is kept, the rule may be invoked by either player at any time. In casual play, it usually only occurs when the materially weaker player grows tired of being chased around the board by an opponent with more strength but who does not know how to complete the mate; in such circumstances the former will challenge the latter to complete the game in 50 moves, or call the game a draw. I.e., counting of moves begins from the challenge, and not from the last capture or move of a pawn.

For the 50-move rule to be effective it is essential that no pawn be moved, as emphasized by underlining, above. The longest standard mate, not involving pawns, is that by two bishops and king against a king alone. It takes a little over 20 moves if the board is otherwise bare, slightly longer if there are opposed pawns which mutually block each other elsewhere on the board. This means that under the 50-move rule the player who thinks he has a win is allowed as much time as he needs to establish that win, plus a generous margin to allow for occasional slips in play.

Diplomacy, like chess, has pieces of equivalent power but of different abilities. Bishops and knights are roughly equivalent in mean strength, but there are things which a bishop can do and a knight cannot, and vice-versa. Similarly, in our game, although armies and fleets have, by rules of the game, exactly equal strength, there are times when it is preferable to have an army in a coastal province, and other times when a fleet would be more advantageous.

A few issues ago, in EMOB #68, Doug Meyerlein described one of these "stalemated" situations which arose in an over-the-board game that he was in. As he rightly pointed out, one side would have been in a stronger position had it had an army in Tuscany instead of a fleet. In the particular instance to which he referred, an attempt to bring up an army would have allowed the ~~enemy~~ to also strengthen the front at that point so that a stand-off would have again been the result. That might not always be the case, however. There might be a case when a player in the position Meyerlein described could bring up an army to replace the fleet, without the other side being able to effectively reply. And, it seems to me, the player involved must always be given sufficient time to make such an exchange, without having the game called off before he can complete the transfer. This, at least, is what is done in chess where the 50 moves of the 50-move rule are about

one and a half times as long as the player would need to complete a mate, in the most difficult case, if he knew the method of perfect play.

Suppose we consider the case that Meyerlein suggested. Suppose that the nearest army that can be spared is one in Norway which is engaged in supporting a force in St. Petersburg. Two fleets, now engaged in backing up the attempted naval advance in the Mediterranean, are dispatched to bring the army to the south. They sail, from the Mid-Atlantic and Spain, respectively, to the North Atlantic, to the Norwegian Sea and to the Barents Sea. The fleet in the Barents Sea takes over the support duty formerly performed by the army in Norway. There is now only one fleet left to convoy the army, so it does it in stages, first to the British Isles, then the convoying fleet moves to the Channel, and convoys the army to France, it marches south, and is finally convoyed to Tuscany. All this must be done as mere preparation, before the attack can be launched for which an army in Tuscany was required. It seems to me that the manoeuvre described could easily use up more than three playing "years" before there is any possibility of securing a supply centre. And I think that the player in such a position should have the opportunity to try it if he wants to and not be faced with an artificial guillotine of three years.

The rule to be used by EMOB is as follows:

1. If all surviving players ask for a draw, it will be declared. This can occur at any time.

2. In the absence of such requests, or in the absence, at any rate, of unanimity among the surviving players, should three playing "years" elapse without transfer of a supply centre, the gamesmaster will ask the remaining players to describe to him, in outline, their plans for victory.

3. Any player who does not submit such a plan of campaign when requested to do so will be deemed to have acceded to a draw.

4. If one player, at least, submits a plan of campaign, the gamesmaster will look it over. If in his judgment the plan does offer some chance of success, the game will continue, just as before.

5. If, on the other hand, the plan appears to the gamesmaster to offer no real hope to the player submitting it, the gamesmaster will call the game a draw.

6. Steps 2, 3, 4, will be repeated as often as necessary.

It is important to note that it is demanded in the "plan of campaign". It need not be a water-tight plan which is guaranteed to succeed against any and all defence; it needs to be a plan which has a reasonable chance of success against reasonable defence. "Sooner or later, X will miss a move. When he does so my attack on Naples will succeed" will not do.

I might say that the matter appears somewhat academic here. Neither of the present EMOB games shows any sign of going to a

"stalelated" position. However, it is well to be prepared for all eventualities. The comments of players, and other readers, on the procedure set out above, are invited.

- - - - -

Deadlines.

A little while ago a player wrote in to suggest that the two week deadline used in PROB gives very little time for negotiation. He suggested that the deadline be extended to two weeks and a half to allow a little more time.

My own feeling is that, usually, slow deadlines result in a loss of interest; all tension and sense of urgency disappears from the game and, as a result, most interest goes as well. So I rather slighted his suggestion.

However, since then, an accident has occurred in one of these games. A player either did not get at all, or got very late, his initial notification of the moves. The word that finally reached him left very little time for him to reply and, in fact, his following moves did not reach here by the deadline, nor on the following day, when the move stencil was out. This player had, previously, submitted a set of conditional moves and they were used; there can be no doubt though that those moves were less satisfactory than his more considered moves would have been. But the latter did not arrive until one day too late.

First, I would like to remind all players that we are in the second half of the twentieth century and that a long distance telephone service exists. (Let us emulate Jutland Jollies and emphasize, while we are at it, that that Scotsman by birth, and Canadian by adoption, Alexander Graham Bell, invented the telephone in the town of Brantford, Ontario. Ever since, Canadians have been the greatest users of the telephone in the world, as a clipping from a New York paper that John Boardman once sent me showed.) In an emergency like that which faced the player mentioned, please phone. If I am at all convinced that the difficulty is in any way my fault I am always willing to pay for the call.

Secondly, however, we come back to the suggestion of the player mentioned in the first paragraph. Do you find the deadline too short? Would a 17 or 18 day schedule be preferable to the current two-week one? All players are asked to state their views. I don't promise to be ruled by majority opinion, but I will consider it.

- - - - -

The Master.

The last issue of Lonely Mountain, #37, takes up the Master, previously published in Graustark. The games listed in the last PROB and shown no Boardman numbers, have now been assigned numbers as follows:

Big Brother #5	1967AK
Diplophobia PQG	1967AL
Xenogonic X-4 (?)	1967AM
Barad-Dur K	1967AN
ADAG MI	1967AO

Since then six additional games have formed, Big Brother's #6, Diplophobia's PSC and PSC, Xenogogic's X-12, Armageddonia's #7, and ADAG's E2. For details of these games and all other games, readers are urged to subscribe to Lonely Mountain (Charles Wells, 3678 Lindholm, Cleveland, Ohio, 44120). Editors, in particular, should inform Charles of beginning and ending of games, changes of players, any errors in published listings, and similar details. In this connection Charles has asked that the following paragraphs be published:

"I did not change the numbers I already assigned for greater chronological accuracy because I thought it would cause too much confusion to do so, and because it can't be kept up. It's simply bound to happen that some one in South Weehawk, West Virginia, starts a game and that I don't find out about it for four months. The Diplomacy world is too big. What I can, and will, do, is start putting the date, or at least the month, the game started in the listing.

"It seems to me that the following principles operate: (1) Do not reassign a number if it turns out that it has been assigned to a game that never got started, or which later becomes vacant for any other reason. I have already carried this out in the case of 1967AI, a team game -- I will not "take away" the number and use it again even though I have stopped including team games. (2). Assign a number to every game you find out about. After all, the point of the system is for keeping records. I am going to try to get those gamesmasters who do not publish Boardman numbers of their own games to start publishing them, at least occasionally in a list if not with every set of moves. I plan to send each one of them a list of the Boardman numbers of his games. But the point of the system is not to get gamesmasters to co-operate -- I intend to assign Boardman numbers to games even when the gamesmaster objects, because Boardman numbers are for records."

During the years that John Boardman maintained the numbers of all Diplomacy games he did an excellent job. Little or nothing escaped his eye. Since he had to drop the task it is fortunate that some one has agreed to take it up - some one with as clear an idea of what is required as Charles Wells expresses in his letter, above.

A Word from our Founder.

Allan Calhoner, inventor of Diplomacy, has stated several times how much his ideas in developing the game were influenced by the writings and lectures of Professor May. See, for example, his article on the origins of Diplomacy, published in Graustark #100, also published in Diplomazia #12. Mr. Calhoner has sent the paragraph, below to most Diplomacy editors. It has already appeared in print elsewhere but is repeated here for the benefit of those who haven't had other chance to see it:

Sidney Bradshaw May.

Professor Sidney B. May died last week at 91. His book, The Origins of the World War, and lectures delivered at Harvard

in 1950-51 were important in leading me to the development of the game of Diplomacy. Prof. May paid unusual attention to the role of the individual decision maker and his contacts with his counterparts in the diplomatic world. The whole interlock of meshing and conflicting intentions, accidents, blunders, etc., was carefully explored. His work appeared from the retrospect of 1951 as something of an antidote to more nearly deterministic approaches that had become prominent.

- Allan L. Calhamer.

Mr. Calhamer also sent a summary of the two matches held in the Marshall Chess Club on August 20th and 27th. They follow:

<u>Player</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Country</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Place</u>
Robin Spital	Russia	10	Turkey	10	20	I
Tom Griffin	England	3	France	12	15	II
Peter Sepulveda	Germany	7	Germany	4	11	III
Andrew Soltis	Austria	1	Russia	7	8	IV
B. Pandolfini	Italy	5	England	0	5	V
Steve Gordon	Turkey	5	Italy	0	5	V
John Meskara	France	5				
Ralph Luciano			Austria	0	5	V

Neither game was played to a conclusion. Points assigned were number of pieces left on board at the end of the game.

In the first game, Russia made alliance with Germany and Turkey, these remaining firm throughout.

In the second game, Turkey with ten points and the corner position was formidable. Italy and Austria attempted to block Turkey, which, however, allied with Russia. He built mainly fleets and argued that Russia, with only one point (from the previous week's play), had the best chance to win the tournament if he attempted to sweep northern Europe.

This editors feeling is that Peter Sepulveda made a remarkable showing. In postal play, Germany has, by far, the poorest record of any power. Sepulveda had the ill luck to draw that country in both matches and yet contrived to come third in the over all rating. If he becomes interested in postal play, there are a lot of people who will have to look to their laurels.

Sailed Bag.

John Koning, 2008 Sherman, Apt. #1, Evanston, Ill., 60201. : On PROB, I must agree with Turner (PROB #70). I found the Current Game Rating List quite fascinating, and was disappointed to see it discontinued. . . While it is true that newer players may be discouraged by immediate losses only balanced by very gradual gains, I do not think this is sufficient to eliminate such a listing. As a matter of fact, I am contemplating publishing a continuous center-year chart, based on Boardman's listings. I am merely fascinated by statistics, I guess.

Along with historians, lawyers, military men, etc., I would like to put forward the assertion that economists make good diplomats. As evidence I offer John Smythe, Roland Rzudiker, and myself...and mention that Pounnelle is a professor of Political Economy. Of course, what I am talking about is Diplomacy players, not diplomats as such. ((+For those who want the Current Game Rating List, the damned thing is back. See page 3. ... Your point on Economists as Diplomats, whether diplomats or not, is well taken. John Smythe's name alone gives considerable weight to your argument. -jamcc)+))

NEW PEOPLE

The following are interested in Diplomacy. Some of them wrote asking about the game and available openings. The names of others were forwarded by Monte Zelazny and Doug Meyerlein.

Bob McLaughton, Hickory Farms of Ohio Store, 38 Parole Plaza, Annapolis, Md., 21401.

Charles Welsh, 6917 Cherry Lane, Annandale, Virginia, 22003.

Paul Scroggie, Sprague, Washington, 99032.

Preston Howard, 103 Westridge Drive, Tallahassee, Fla., 32304.

Eduard Malle, 107 SE 8th St., Gainesville, Fla., 32601.

Terney Word, 184 South Cassier Dr., St. Petersburg Beach, Fla., 33706.

Scott Howard, 104 Franklyn Ave., Indiatlantic, Fla.

Robert Borries, Box 115, Orange Park, Fla., 32073.

And, with the decks awash in fresh blood, it is a fortunate thing that there is to be a new journal to sop up some of it. Douglas Meyerlein, 3934 S. W. Southern, Seattle, Wash., 98116, announces that he and Doug Baker will jointly publish a new 'zine to be called Bigiart. Game fee is \$2.

Diplomacy is a game manufactured and sold by Games Research, Inc., 48 Wareham St., Boston, Mass., 02118. The postal version of the game has given rise to a host of magazines. One of the latter is

ENOBDIK MAG, which is published and edited by J. A. McCallum, Kelston, Alberta, Canada. It sells for ten cents a copy. The game rate applies for copies of back issues and also for subscriptions. This magazine trades with all other Postal Diplomacy Bulletins which are known to its editor.